1944

File No. City Police II/44

Legal Department

B **BRANCH**

Subject:— Rules and Notifications under the City of Bombay Police Act 1902

E page 5 1944

File No. City Police II/44

Gen. 194 e.

202-B

No. 3262-III.
Home Department.
Bombay Castle, 17th February 1944.

NOTIFICATION.

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 28-A of the City of Bombay Police Act, 1902 (Bombay IV of 1902), the Government of Bombay is pleased to appoint the following persons to be Veterinary Practitioners for the purposes of the said Act for the whole of the City of Bombay, in addition to those appointed under Government Notification, Home Department, No.3262-III, dated the 4th August 1931:-

1. Dr. M.D. Schar, G.B.V.C.
2. Dr. J.J. Deshi, G.B.V.C.
3. Dr. R.P.Vedak, G.B.V.C.
4. Major John Robertson, M.R.C.V.S.
5. Dr. D.H. Velankar, G.B.&V.C.
6. Dr. M.A. Merchant, G.B.V.C.
7. Dr. V.G. Akula, G.B.V.C.
8. Dr. C. Olivera, G.B.V.C.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

H.V.R.Iengar,
Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Home Department.

No.3262-III-D
Home Department.
Bombay Castle, 17th February 1944.

Copies forwarded with compliements, for information to:-

The Commissioner of Police, Bombay, with reference to his letter No.1228/110, dated the 25th Janury 1944
The Accountant General, Bombay,
The Remembrancer of Legal Affairs,
The Finance Department,
The Revenue Department,

77/118

2. The Veterinary Practitioners appointed under the foregoing Notification should be granted an honorarium of Rs. 15/- for each visit in addition to actual conveyance hire when called out by the Police to visit the place of

an incident in accordance with rule 1 in section A of Appendix XVIII-A of the Bombay Civil Services Rules Volume II.

By order of the Governor of Bombay,

Sd/-
For Secretary to the Government of Bombay,
Home Department.

R.D.P.
13/7/56

S.C.

Office of the R.L.A.

Except rule 19 the other Muharram rules may be considered as falling either under section 22 (1)(f)(ii) and (h) or section 23 of the Act. As pointed out by H.D. rule 4 may be considered as falling under clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 23 but rules (viii),(ix) and the first sentence of rule (xic) (which properly speaking are Orders) are relatable to sub-section (3) of section 23 of the Act. Those orders prohibit processions for more than seven days and therefore attract the provisions of the proviso to that sub-section. Under that proviso no order prohibiting any procession shall remain in force for more than seven days without the sanction of the Provincial Government. Orders (viii),(ix) and (xiv) which prohibit processions for more than seven days cannot, therefore, be made unless the sanction of the Provincial Government is obtained as required by the said proviso.

2. The view taken by H.D. as regards rule (v) is correct. Since that rule has been made permanent, it will not be necessary to approach Government every year for obtaining its previous sanction thereto.

3. It may incidentally be pointed out that rule (xv) follows the language of clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 23 of the Act as it existed prior to its amendment by Bombay Act III of 1942. That rule may now be brought is line with the clause as amended by that Act.

R.D.P 1317 S.C.

Id/- P.M.M. 22/7/44.
Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

U.R. to H.D.5222,dated the 24th July 1944.

Office of the R.L.A.

Before the draft notifications at pages 3 and 9 ante are scrutinized, the H.D. is requested to clarify and consider the following points:-

(a) It is presumed that division "G" consisting of 39 villages proposed to be constituted under section 11 of the City of Bombay Police Act, 1902 would be a new division.

(b) Since the police stations already constituted will be abolished, it will be more in order to specify the actual limits of the proposed sections. It is not clear whether it is desired by the notification at page 3 to include in the "sections" specified in clause (b) the areas which at present constitute the police stations and outposts mentioned against them. In this connection it may be pointed out that police stations and outposts cannot be constituted under section 11 of the City of Bombay Police Act, 1902.

(c) The H.D. is requested to state whether it is intended to abolish the police stations and outposts mentioned in the ~~maximum~~ notification at page 9 ante altogether and the areas comprised therein are to be absorbed without being split up in one or other of the proposed sections.

If it is not intended to do so, it would be necessary to reconstitute these police stations for the purposes of the Greater Bombay by issuing the requisite notifications. Moreover, the draft notification at page 9 ante seeks to cancel certain notifications pertaining to the creation of five police stations and outposts and so much part of the local areas of the Bombay Suburban District specified under these five police stations as is proposed to be included in the Greater Bombay.

Thus the local areas of the Bombay Suburban District which are included in the present police stationsm of Bandra, Santra Cruz, etc. and its outposts, but which on the introduction of the Greater Bombayxxm Scheme would not be included in the Greater Bombay, would remain without being included in the jurisdiction of any police station or outpost. A draft notification for including such areas within the limits of some other police station or outpost is therefore necessary.

Id/-

P.N.M.

13/10/44.

Remembrancer of Legal Affairs.

U.R. to H.D.,7180 dated the 19th October 1944.

Submitted for sight

Id/-
13/10

R.D.P.
13/7/56

S.C.